



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,046	01/25/2002	Katsumi Kanasaki	RCOH-1044	3429

7590 08/17/2006

KNOBLE & YOSHIDA, LLC

Suite 1350
Eight Penn Center
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/057,046

Applicant(s)

KANASAKI, KATSUMI

Examiner

Ranodhi Serrao

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 31 May 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. The applicant argued in substance the newly added limitations of independent claims 1, 12, 21, and 22. However, the new grounds teach these and the added features. See rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the second address" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Holleran et al. (5,752,059). Holleran et al. teaches a method of flexibly managing addresses for a communication system (col. 3, lines 26-52), comprising the steps of: requesting an address definition from a second device to a first device; returning the address definition to the second device from the first device (col. 5, lines 40-45); obtaining a corresponding predetermined rule definition for the address definition to generate a new address (col. 8, lines 1-20); automatically generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition at the second device (col. 8, lines 46-65); and returning the newly generated address definition from the second address to the first device (col. 9, lines 13-23).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 2141

10. Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holleran et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Krishnaswamy et al. (5,999,525).

11. As per claim 3, Holleran et al. teaches the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fails to teach wherein the first device is an existing user account management unit for user account information. However, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches wherein the first device is an existing user account management unit for user account information (see Krishnaswamy et al., column 23, lines 37-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Holleran et al. to wherein the first device is an existing user account management unit for user account information in order to attach individual systems for billing, provisioning, directory services, messaging services such as voice messaging via a communication link (see Krishnaswamy et al., col. 23, lines 23-36).

12. As per claims 4, 10, and 11, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 3 applies fully in order to combine Holleran et al. and Krishnaswamy et al..

13. As per claim 4, Holleran et al. and Krishnaswamy et al. teach an address maintenance unit that corresponds to the existing user account management unit for managing address information (see Krishnaswamy et al., column 23, lines 37-47).

14. As per claim 10, Holleran et al. and Krishnaswamy et al. teach wherein said generating the new address definition is performed prior to said requesting the address definition (see Krishnaswamy et al., column 108, lines 21-32).

Art Unit: 2141

15. As per claim 11, Holleran et al. and Krishnaswamy et al. teach wherein the address definition each has a unique ID and further comprises additional steps of determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists (see Krishnaswamy et al., column 102, lines 50-67).

16. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. and Holleran et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Taylor et al. (5,754,306). Krishnaswamy et al. and Holleran et al. teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above but fail to teach wherein the addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax numbers. However, Taylor et al. teaches wherein the addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax numbers (see Taylor et al., column 10, lines 28-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the addresses include e-mail addresses, document folders, telephone number and fax numbers in order to optimize user efficiency in electronic communications.

17. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnaswamy et al. and Holleran et al. as applied to claims 1, and 4 above, and further in view of Ouchi (5,978,836).

18. As per claim 5, Krishnaswamy et al. and Holleran et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 4 as described above but fail to teach wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method. Ouchi however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method (column 12, lines 46-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by adding a new delivery method in order to go off route and capture the optimal route of transmission.

19. As per claim 6, Krishnaswamy et al. and Holleran et al. teach the limitations of claims 1, 4, and 5 as described above but fail to teach wherein the new delivery method is specified in the rule definition. Ouchi however teaches wherein the new delivery method is specified in the rule definition (column 8, lines 13-31). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the new delivery method is specified in the rule definition in order to insure that the value for the active document is unique.

20. As per claim 7, Ouchi, Holleran et al., and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1, 4, 5, and 6 as described above but Ouchi and Holleran et al. fail to teach wherein the rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally manages an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value. Krishnaswamy et al., however teaches wherein the rule definition further includes or the address

maintenance unit additionally manages an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value (column 99, line 58-column 101, line 16: wherein VNET numbers serve the function of a Condition value, unique ID serves the function of an ID value, IP address serves the function of a Source value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the rule definition further includes or the address maintenance unit additionally manages an ID value, a Source value, a Condition value, a Name Generation Method value, and a Type Generation Method value in order to allow an user to register his/her computer as "on-line" and available to receive calls.

21. As per claim 8, Holleran et al. and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 4 as described above but fail to teach wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method. Ouchi however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method (column 6, line 48-column 7, line 7). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit manages delivery methods by deleting an existing delivery method in order to permit more than one concurrent use of a workflow route.

22. As per claim 9, Ouchi, Holleran et al., and Krishnaswamy et al. teach the limitations of claims 1 and 4, as described above but Ouchi and Holleran et al. fail to

Art Unit: 2141

teach wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information. Krishnaswamy et al. however teaches wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information (column 41, lines 27-35). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above limitation to add wherein the address maintenance unit updates the address information based upon the user account information because cache copies must be refreshed when the version is out of date.

23. Claims 12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holleran et al. and Krishnaswamy et al.

24. As per claim 12, Holleran et al. teaches a system for flexibly managing addresses for a communication system, comprising: a third device sending a request for an address definition for use with a predetermined operation; a second device connected to said third device for receiving the request for the address definition and sending the request for the address definition (see Holleran et al., col. 3, lines 26-52); and a first device connected to said second device for returning the address definition to said second device in response to the address definition request (see Holleran et al., col. 5, lines 40-45); wherein said second device obtaining a corresponding predetermined rule definition for the address definition to generate a new address (see Holleran et al., col. 8, lines 1-20) and automatically generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition (see Holleran et al., col. 8,

Art Unit: 2141

lines 46-65), said second device returning the newly generated address definition to said third device (see Holleran et al., col. 9, lines 13-23). But fails to teach said first device further including a address maintenance unit for maintaining address information. However, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches said first device further including a address maintenance unit for maintaining address information (see Krishnaswamy et al., col. 23, lines 37-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Holleran et al. to said first device further including a address maintenance unit for maintaining address information in order to allow users to manage more aspects of a network than previously possible and control network activities from a central site (see Krishnaswamy et al., col. 1, lines 24-34).

25. As per claim 22, Holleran et al. teaches a computer readable medium storing computer executable instructions for performing the task of flexibly managing addresses for a communication system, the computer executable instructions comprising the steps of: requesting an address definition from a second device to a first device; returning the address definition to the second device from the first device (see Holleran et al., col. 5, lines 40-45); obtaining a corresponding predetermined rule definition for the address definition to generate a new address (see Holleran et al., col. 8, lines 1-20); automatically generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition at the second device (see Holleran et al., col. 8, lines 46-65). But fails to teach returning the newly generated address definition from the second address to the first device, the address definition each has a unique ID; determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does

Art Unit: 2141

not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists. However, Krishnaswamy et al. teaches returning the newly generated address definition from the second address to the first device (see Krishnaswamy et al., column 184, lines 1-10), the address definition each has a unique ID; determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists (see Krishnaswamy et al., column 102, lines 50-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Holleran et al. to returning the newly generated address definition from the second address to the first device, the address definition each has a unique ID; determining whether or not an ID already exists; storing the newly generated address if the ID does not exist; and replacing information with the newly generated address if the ID exists in order to allow users to manage more aspects of a network than previously possible and control network activities from a central site (see Krishnaswamy et al., col. 1, lines 24-34).

26. Claims 13-21 have similar limitations as to claims 1-12 and 22; therefore, they are being rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571) 272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER